

RC22

26/12/03
8/7/03
[Signature]

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appn. Number 09/872,914
Appn. Filed 06/01/2001
Applicant Ferdinand Schermel
Title Tilttable Modular Recycle Container System
Examiner Stephen J. Costellano
Art Unit 3727

FAX RECEIVED

JUL 31 2003

GROUP 3700

AMENDMENT D

July 31, 2003

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

total no. of pages of text 42
total no. of pages of drawing 1
1 petition for extension of time
1 credit card payment form

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed 04/01/2003,

The applicant is filing an amendment to the claims and specification to be considered. The applicant is unclear to the date of reduction to practice of the details of the patent since the reference has a Date of Patent of Jan 23/2001 which is more than one year and four months after the Applicant's Provisional patent filing date of June 6/2000. Although the filing date of the patent is earlier, it is unknown what changes and additions were made.

"t patent" remarks
are not understood

The applicant demonstrates that the prior art is overcome by the clarification of the terms and claims the arguments that define the invention over the existing art. Applicant has a limited ability in understanding patent terminology due to this being the first application. Applicant's slowness in grasping the concepts makes phone conversations difficult without first reading the specific arguments by the examiner towards the specific arguments put forth in this response and the response to the first office action. Applicant requests that the examiner provides written specific details regarding the issues of any further rejections, if any objections still remain after these changes, in order to determine the future course of action.

examiner has
provided sufficient
written specific
details throughout
the prosecution

REMARKS

Applicant is presently pursuing the amendment and subsequent rejection of Fig 1 which shows the invention of the rigid entity with two attachable containers instead of the original simplest or minimal configuration of the invention of the rigid entity with one attachable container. Both show the invention of the rigid entity, the amended version is to add clarity and is shown (reduced to practice) in the provisional patent visually. Applicant still waits for the response from the supervisor and from the examiner to the explanation and questions asked in the previously sent fax of Dec. 12, 2002, and June 27, 2003 sent to

The Dec. 12, 2002 fax was
responded to by
the letter mailed
1/2/03 as per
No. 22.
The June 27, 2003
fax was responded
to by the letter
mailed August 8, 2003
as per No. 27.